$\mathcal{U}$.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,101	07/06/2001	Brent Carlson	2003696-0003	4414

7590   05/07/2004

Kent J Sieffert
Shumaker & Sieffert P A
8425 Seasons Parkway
Suite 105
St. Paul, MN 55125

EXAMINER
CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

$\mathcal{G}$

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/900,101	CARLSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Chavis	2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 July 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-53_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-53_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5, 8_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The information disclosure statement filed 5-7-02 and 10-15-02 fails to comply

with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the

relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c)

most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is

not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the

information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng

(6,067,548).

CLAIMS:	Cheng
1. A software utility for interacting with a user to classify a resource according to a predetermined domain model, the utility comprising:	See the title and the abstract.
data type mapping means that allow the user to map data types to the domain	See figs. 3-7.

model;

    function mapping means that allow the   See figs. 3, 5, and 7
user to map resource functions to the
domain model;

    identification means that allow the user   See col. 8 lines 17-col. 9 line 4.
to specify the location of the resource; and

    a database comprising data type maps,   See col. 7 lines 25-53.
resource function maps, and location
information specified by the user.

    2. The software utility of claim 1, wherein   See col. 11 lines 4-42.
the domain model comprises: a process
model comprising processes and use
cases;

    a structural model comprising reference   See col. 11 lines 4-24.
components, reference interfaces, and
reference functions.

    3. The software utility of claim 2, wherein   See the rejection of claim 2.
portions of the process model are linked to
reference components, reference
interfaces, or reference functions of the
structural model.

    4. The software utility of claim 3, wherein   See the rejection of claim 2.
the domain model comprises a plurality of
process models, portions of each process
model linked to reference components,
reference interfaces, or reference functions

of the structural model.

5. The software utility of claim 2, wherein the data type mapping means allow the user to map data types to the structural model.

See the rejection of claim 2.

6. The software utility of claim 2, wherein the function mapping means allow the user to map functions to the structural model.

See the rejection of claim 2.

7. The software utility of claim 1 wherein the data type mapping means or the function mapping means use synonyms to suggest mapping candidates.

This feature is considered the essence of mapping. Also, see the virtual link feature in col. 12 Lines27-63.

8. The software utility of claim 1, wherein the data type mapping means or the function mapping means comprise means for the user to provide comments, the comments being stored in the database.

The applicants system is not considered to actually provide comments; however, it is considered inherent for apps. To have means for providing comments to enable different programmers or users to provide easy modifications. Therefore, the feature is considered inherent in Chengs system for the same reason.

9. The software utility of claim 8, wherein

Again no comments are actually

the comments are associated with a particular data type or resource function and include information relating to quality of the mapping.

provided in the applicants system. Claim 8 only provides means for the user to provide Comments. Therefore, this claim is rejected as claim 8. Although specific comments would be considered a choice of design, no comments exist in the claim.

10. The software utility of claim 8, wherein the comments are associated with a particular data type or resource function and include information relating to the purposes or usage of individual functions or data types.

See the rejection of claim 9.

11. The software utility of claim 1, further comprising search means for searching the database.

Databases inherently have search means to assist in Locating specific items in massive locations. Therefore, Chengs system is also considered to inherently provide for the feature for the same reason. Furthermore, see the summary of the invention. Also, see col. 19 lines 7-30.

As per claims 12 and 24, see the rejection of claim 1.

The features of claims 13-14 and 22, 25 are taught via claim 11.

In reference to claims 15-16, see col. 17 lines 54-67.

Claims 17-18 are taught via col. 19 lines 31-52.

As per claim 19, see the Cheng's claims 6-7.

The features of claims 20 are taught via the "dynamic" portions cited for claim 17.

In reference to claim 21, see the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 23 is taught via figs. 8-10.

As per claims 26-28, see Cheng's claims 15-16.

The features of claim 29 are inherent via col. 19 lines 31-52.

In reference to claims 30, see fig. 1.

Claims 31-33 are taught via fig. 3.

As per claims 34-39, see the rejection of claims 3, 4-5, 7, 8, 9 and 10, respectively.

The features of claim 40 are taught via claim 11.

In reference to claim 41, the feature is considered inherent via col. 12 lines 8-18 and also, see col. 16 lines 1-9.

Claim 42 is taught via col. 19 lines 7-30, which clearly provides for the results of search specifications to be shared between multiple users.

As per claim 43, see again the cited portions of claim 42.

The features of claims 44 and 46 are taught via col. 19 lines 43-52, which indicates that the system remains dynamic even when resources are not available and provides for dynamic relationships (be extensible and flexible) among resources, col. 2 lines 51-65.

In reference to claim 45, see col. 4 lines 25-35.

Claim 46 is taught via col. 3 line 40-col.-col. 4 line 35.

As per claim 47, see fig. 1.

The features of claim 48-50, see col. 3 lines 16-39 and col. 6 lines 46-67. Also, see col. 10 lines 53-61, since a graph is considered a "report".

In reference to claims 51-53, see the rejection of claims 1-11 above.

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jqc

April 30, 2004

JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124